

INFORMATION LETTER

Not for
Publication

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

For Members
Only

No. 587

Washington, D. C.

February 8, 1936

Recent Developments in the Social Security Field

Since the issuance in January of the special pamphlet on the Social Security Program, there have been a few developments which may be of interest to canners.

Federal Legislation

A number of proposed amendments to the Federal Social Security Act have been introduced in Congress. The Lundeen bill, H. R. 9680, also introduced in the Senate as S. 3475, would provide a nation-wide system of social insurance somewhat more comprehensive and more liberal than that established by the Federal Social Security Act, including among its provisions employees in agriculture, fisheries and other employments not included in the present Act. It provides for an initial appropriation of five billion dollars, but specifies no new taxes or other means of covering the proposed appropriation. The Cravens bill, H. R. 10122, seeks to amend the grants to States for old-age assistance by increasing the amount which the Federal Government would pay from \$15 to \$45 a month. The Marcantonio bill, H. J. Res. 440, would provide an amendment to the Federal Constitution expressly to permit the enactment of a Federal program of social security, thereby seeking to remove any possible constitutional doubts. Whether any of these measures will be enacted cannot be forecast. They indicate, however, the present strong Congressional sentiment in favor of social security measures.

State Legislation

The Federal Social Security Board has formally approved the unemployment compensation laws of Alabama, Washington, and Oregon. This approval is necessary in order that taxes paid under State laws may be credited against the Federal unemployment compensation tax, which went into effect on January 1, 1936.

On January 16, 1936, the Ohio House of Representatives passed a bill providing for a State unemployment compensation system, which measure it is expected will soon be passed by the Ohio Senate and approved by the Governor. The special session of the Minnesota Legislature adjourned January 25, 1936, without passing any unemployment compensation law, but left the study of the problem to a special commission which was directed to report at the next session.

Constitutionality

On January 18, 1936, the constitutionality of the New York law was questioned in a suit seeking to enjoin the collection of contributions required by the New York law. The statute was assailed on the grounds that it violated the due process clause and that the system of pooling funds was discriminatory.

Interpretations

In Part III, Section 3, of the Association's pamphlet, there was a discussion of the items to be included in computing

total taxable wages of an employee. The California Unemployment Reserves Commission has recently issued some new regulations on this subject. Wages paid during a vacation must be included. Workmen's compensation benefits and sick benefits are not classified as wages. Contributions by a well employee to a sick benefit fund, however, must be included. If the employer contributes to the payment of premiums for group insurance for his employees, such payments are not to be included. Traveling expenses and car allowances, up to a reasonable amount, are to be considered as business expenses and not as part of wages. These California regulations, of course, have no effect outside of that State but they are indicative of the questions being raised and the manner in which other State commissions may rule.

Payroll Record Forms

The Association has received a number of requests for printed payroll record forms which can be used for recording the data necessary to prepare reports to the Government under the Social Security Act. The Association has prepared and distributed a bulletin entitled "The Social Security Program," Part V of which has to do with the employment records for Federal and State Statutory Reports.

This bulletin also contains suggested forms for the individual service record and for a payroll record. It is believed that these two forms will meet the requirements of the Federal act and can be easily adjusted to meet the requirements of the various State acts. It should be pointed out, however, that the regulations regarding forms and records may be changed from time to time in the process of perfecting the administration of the law. Furthermore, many States have not yet enacted unemployment compensation laws and the requirements of those which have been enacted are not at all uniform. It was therefore decided that it would be impracticable at this time to print a form which would meet the requirements of both the Federal act and each State act. The form appearing in the bulletin entitled "The Social Security Program" was suggested with the expectation that canners might desire to modify their own payroll forms to meet the requirements of these new laws.

It should be pointed out that the deductions from employee's wages for the Federal Old Age Benefit Tax and the tax on employers for Federal Old Age Benefits will not become effective until January 1, 1937; consequently records relating to old age benefit need not be kept during 1936. In other words, during 1936 records need to be kept of your total payroll on which the Federal tax is based and that portion of the payroll to which the State unemployment compensation deductions and tax apply. It may, therefore, be possible to utilize during 1936 the payroll form that is now in use by simply recording the deductions and calculating the tax required under your particular State unemployment compensation law.

In view of the fact the Federal tax is based on total payroll less the total of the amounts paid to exempted employees, it is not absolutely necessary that a separate column be kept for the Federal unemployment compensation tax.

The requirements for 1936 might very well be met by the addition of one or two columns (columns 9 and 15 of the suggested payroll form) to the payroll form now in use. Some payroll forms contain columns that are little used. It might be possible to change the headings of these columns and meet the requirements of these unemployment compensation acts for 1936.

The experience gained during the first year of operation of the law will, no doubt, enable one to set up payroll forms at the beginning of 1937 which will meet the requirements much more satisfactorily than any form which could be set up at this time.

Refund of Processing Taxes on Sugar

Canners using sugar in the manufacture of their products will be interested in the reply of the Association's legal counsel to an inquiry from a canner in respect to the possibility of obtaining a refund of processing taxes on sugar used in manufacturing apple sauce in inventory as of January 13th last. This reply stated:

"Section 21(d) (2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended on August 24, 1935, provides that:

"In the event that any tax imposed by this title is finally held invalid by reason of any provision of the constitution, or is finally held invalid by reason of the Secretary of Agriculture's exercise or failure to exercise any power conferred on him under this title, there shall be refunded or credited to any person (*not a processor or other person who paid the tax*) who would have been entitled to a refund or credit pursuant to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 16, had the tax terminated by proclamation pursuant to the provisions of section 13, and in lieu thereof, a sum in an amount equivalent to the amount to which such person would have been entitled had the Act been valid and had the tax with respect to the particular commodity terminated immediately prior to the effective date of such holding of invalidity, . . ."

"Unfortunately, however, Section 16(b) provides that:

"The tax refund . . . shall not apply . . . to any article (except sugar) processed wholly or in chief value from sugar beets, sugar cane or any product thereof . . ."

"We assume from your letter that you were not the person who paid the tax and consequently you would be permitted to file a refund under Section 21(d) (2) except for the limitation of Section 16. The reason for this limitation is that when the processing tax on sugar was put into effect, no floor stock taxes were levied on canned goods containing sugar but only on sugar held on June 8, 1934. Accordingly, we are constrained to advise that you are entitled to file a claim for refund on any sugar which you still hold in inventory but not on manufactured apple sauce.

"This question has nothing to do directly with the unconstitutionality of the statute. Had you been the tax-

payer—that is, the individual who paid the tax—you would be in a position to file a refund claim for taxes paid by you. As you undoubtedly know, a statutory provision permitting an individual who has actually not paid the tax to file a claim for refund is unusual and its provisions must be complied with literally.

"We would suggest, however, that inasmuch as your purchase price included this tax, you write immediately to the concern which sold you the sugar stating that in the event they secure a refund of processing taxes with respect to this sugar, you will look to them to refund such sums to you."

What's Doing in Congress

The serious business in Congress during the week has consisted largely of appropriation bills, although there has been much jockeying about by inflationists to prevent the introduction of a tax bill at this session. The problem of raising half a billion dollars to finance the impending A.A.A. substitute has been the subject of conferences at the White House and among congressional leaders, but no definite plan has been announced. Much thought has been given to recovering the impounded A.A.A. processing taxes ordered returned to processors by the Supreme Court. The Senate Agricultural Committee's "substitute for the Bankhead substitute for the original Bankhead bill to amend the Soil Erosion Act" reached the floor of the Senate on February 6th as unfinished business. This bill and others on which some progress was made are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Cotton, Potato, and Tobacco Acts Repealed

Acting upon the President's request, both Houses passed a bill (S. 3934) repealing the Bankhead Cotton Act of 1934, the Potato Act of 1935, and the Kerr-Smith Tobacco Act. It will be recalled that in the analysis of the A.A.A. decision by Mr. H. Thomas Austern of the Association's counsel, which was published in the INFORMATION LETTER for January 9th, it was stated that in the light of the A.A.A. decision these Acts would probably be held invalid.

A.A.A. Substitute

Both the Bankhead bill (S. 3780, described in the INFORMATION LETTER of February 1st) and the companion Jones bill (H. R. 10835) have been amended to increase the likelihood of passing the test of constitutionality. Instead of a temporary period of two years during which the Secretary of Agriculture was to make payments direct to individual farmers, and thereafter make allotments to States with suitable programs, both bills now authorize the Secretary to make allotments to States as soon as they qualify with acceptable plans for carrying out the purposes of the bills.

A State plan to effectuate one or more of the purposes set forth in the bills must name as an agency to administer the plan a land grant college or colleges or such other state agency as may be approved by the Secretary, and must insure the participation in the administration of the plan by such county and community committees or associations of agricultural producers organized for such purpose as the Secretary finds necessary. The state plan must also provide for submission of reports that the Secretary finds necessary for determining whether the plan is being carried out according to its terms.

The Secretary would also be authorized to make direct payments for not more than two years in such States as fail to qualify for allotments. There are other changes in the bills, mostly aimed at restating the purposes of the legislation so as to conform more nearly to the requirements of the recent A.A.A. decision.

The conditions under which payments can be made to farmers are essentially the same as noted in the INFORMATION LETTER for February 1st, although the wording has been changed somewhat and will probably be further changed before final passage. The Secretary is to have power to make payments based upon the acreage of crop land, the use or treatment of the land for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion, and upon changes in the use of land. The domestic allotment plan is also retained in both bills, but the Senate bill has omitted consideration of total crop acreage as a basis for payments. In determining the amount of payment based on the use or treatment of the land for soil restoration, soil conservation, and prevention of erosion and on changes in the use of the land, the Secretary is to "take into consideration the productivity of the land affected by the farming practices adopted during the year with respect to which such payment is made."

Price Discrimination Bills

The Robinson bill (S. 3154) has been reported out favorably, without hearings, by the Senate Judiciary Committee and is thus further advanced than the companion Patman bill and the recently introduced Utterback bill (H. R. 10486), both of which are in the House Judiciary Committee, where hearings commenced on February 3rd before a subcommittee headed by Mr. Utterback. There is some talk of recommitting the Robinson bill for hearings, and there is a rather general feeling that no one of the bills is in final form for passage. The Robinson bill came before the Senate on February 4th under the unanimous-consent order of business and was "passed over."

New Alaska Fish-Trap Bill

Representative Sirovich has introduced a bill (H. R. 10797) limiting the use of traps, weirs, and pound nets in the waters of Alaska and specifying the maximum size of purse seines that may be used. This bill differs from the Dimond bill previously introduced by limiting the number of traps, weirs, and pound nets to three per cannery, whereas the Dimond bill would prohibit the use of such traps. The Sirovich bill has been referred to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, where hearings on the Dimond bill were recently held.

Seafood Inspection Appropriation

The deficiency bill as recently passed by Congress carries \$33,000 for salaries of seafood inspectors authorized by S. 3194, which was an amendment to the Food and Drugs Act that was approved in August. Heretofore the cost of such seafood inspection has been borne entirely by the producer. The deficiency bill that was defeated by a filibuster in the last session carried \$60,000 for the purpose, and the amount now voted is based on the estimated need for the remaining months of the current fiscal year, which ends on June 30th.

Exportation of Tin-Plate Scrap Prohibited

A bill to prohibit the exportation of tin-plate scrap, except upon license issued by the President, was passed by the House on February 3rd. As this bill (S. 3381) had previously passed the Senate, it now needs only the approval of the President. It is designed, in the interest of national defense, to protect domestic sources of tin and to restrain the depletion of domestic reserves of tin-bearing materials. The present capacity of the American detinning industry is said to be over 30,000 tons a year, but foreign interests have been bidding so high for American scrap that the domestic industry has found it difficult to find adequate supplies.

Status of Other Bills

WALSH BILL—The subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee is planning to report to the full committee this week on the study it has made of some 4,000 government contracts and of the replies to a questionnaire sent out to get information in connection with this bill to prescribe labor conditions in government contracts, etc. It is possible that a date for hearings may be set for some time during the week of February 10th.

BLACK 30-HOUR BILL—This bill (S. 87) came before the Senate on February 4th under the unanimous-consent order of business and was "passed over."

Hearing on Proposed Regulations for Canned Salmon Inspection

The Food and Drug Administration has distributed, under date of February 1st, proposed regulations for canned salmon under the Seafood Amendment to the Food and Drugs Act. These regulations are similar in scope to those that have been enforced during the past two years in connection with the canning of shrimp.

Salmon cannerys may make application for inspection under these regulations and such inspection may be maintained by the Secretary of Agriculture at his discretion, the applicant complying with the regulations and paying the fees provided in them.

Proposed regulations now being distributed are "merely tentative, and are offered for the purpose of discussion at a hearing to be held at Seattle, Washington, in Room 106, Chamber of Commerce Building, Third and Columbia streets, at 10 A. M. Monday, February 24th, 1936."

Those who are unable to attend the hearing in person are invited to mail their suggestions to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C., not later than February 27th, 1936.

Unique Book on Structure and Composition of Foods

It is not customary to include book reviews in the INFORMATION LETTER, but "Structure and Composition of Foods, Vol. II (Vegetables, Legumes, Fruits)," by Andrew L. Winton and Kate Barber Winton, is unique, and therefore an exception is made.

Because of the nature of the book, the authors found it best to use technical terms freely, especially in connection

with the illustrations of microscopic structures. There are more than 300 of these illustrations, nearly all of them showing the histology of various fruits and vegetables. These illustrations, therefore, constitute the most valuable feature of the work, since they represent the authors' original work, many of them recorded here for the first time, and since the authors are the foremost authorities on this subject.

The literature citations throughout the volume are of inestimable value. The introduction gives a good review of recent developments in plant chemistry, including the nature and occurrence of the natural colors, acids and vitamins.

The book has many unique features, such as, for instance, recording in one volume and in connection with each other a description of the macroscopic and microscopic appearance of vegetables and fruits, and their chemical composition, and the emphasis that is given to the relation of structure to chemical composition. The book is intended for chemists and microscopists, and will be found indispensable to all who are interested in the chemical analysis and microscopic examination of food products. It is a volume of over 900 pages and is published by John Wiley & Sons, New York City.

Quarterly Stock Survey

Wholesale distributors' holdings of six canned food items on January 1, 1936, were 7 per cent under those on the corresponding date of the preceding year, according to the quarterly stock survey of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Canners' stocks, on the other hand, increased as the result of the larger 1935 packs. The Bureau's report follows:

"Packers' holdings of the six canned foods included in this report were larger on January 1, 1936, than on January 1 of last year. Increases ranged from 1 per cent in the case of pears to 244 per cent in the case of peas. Intervening packs prevent calculations of percentage disappearance from October 1, 1935, to January 1, 1936, for most of the items. Such percentage disappearance figures may be compiled for pears and peaches, 114 canners of the former product having moved 25 per cent of their October 1 holdings during the last three months of 1935, and 27 canners of peaches having moved 26 per cent of their October 1 holdings during the last quarter of 1935.

"Four hundred and thirty-one wholesale distributors had stocks of the six items combined 7 per cent smaller than a year ago. Their holdings of peas, corn and tomatoes show little change, but distributors' stocks of green and wax beans, peaches and pears were substantially smaller on January 1, 1936, as compared with the same date of the previous year. The normal seasonal increase from October 1 to January 1 was recorded. Distributors' stocks of the six items combined increased 17 per cent between those two dates in 1935, which was the same percentage increase as reported during the preceding year.

"Figures on canners' and distributors' holdings of pineapple are purposely omitted from this report, because of lack of representative data.

"The figures in this survey are based on reports from the same firms for January 1, 1936, October 1, 1935, and January 1, 1935. They are not total stocks for any item, but are comparative in that they represent the change in holdings based upon a cross section of the canners and of the distributors and are therefore representative of conditions in the industry and trade. Comparisons may not be made between the different products in canners' hands due to varying percentages of the total packs represented by the reporting groups. The distributor group includes so-called "second hands," that is, wholesale grocers, centrally owned and voluntary chains, etc. It does not include retail stocks."

STOCKS OF SIX CANNED FOODS IN REPRESENTATIVE CANNERS' HANDS

(Based on Reports from Same Firms for Each Date)

Commodity	Representative stocks, sold and unsold			Pct.
	Jan. 1, 1936	Oct. 1, 1935	Jan. 1, 1935	
Peas (114 firms)...	7,067,479	9,493,651	2,052,873	+ 244
Corn (129 firms)...	6,469,450	10,002,441	2,356,055	+ 174
Tomatoes (203 firms)...	3,764,415	*258,666	3,024,712	+ 24
Green and wax beans (137 firms)...	1,808,929	2,603,452	1,703,970	+ 6
Peaches (27 firms)...	5,046,234	6,816,764	3,316,166	+ 52
Pears (34 firms)...	2,210,986	2,430,697	2,186,932	+ 1

* Does not include any 1935 pack prior to Oct. 1st.

STOCKS OF SIX CANNED FOODS IN HANDS OF 431 WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTORS

(Based on Reports from the Same Firms for Each Date)

Commodity	Representative stocks		Change in stocks	
	Jan. 1, 1936	Oct. 1, 1935	Oct. 1, 1935, to Jan. 1, 1936	Oct. 1, 1934, to Jan. 1, 1935
Peas	1,349,614	1,496,431	- 10	- 5
Corn	1,259,102	902,910	+ 39	+ 31
Tomatoes	1,497,878	1,070,945	+ 40	+ 43
Green and wax beans	511,897	522,559	- 2	+ 7
Peaches	664,921	549,075	+ 21	+ 9
Pears	249,693	190,228	+ 31	+ 25
Total (6 items)	5,533,105	4,732,148	+ 17	+ 17

Commodity	Representative stocks		Comparison, Jan. 1, 1936, with Jan. 1, 1935	
	Jan. 1, 1936	Jan. 1, 1935	Pct.	Pct.
Peas	1,349,614	1,361,617	- 1	+ 4
Corn	1,259,102	1,288,730	- 2	- 14
Tomatoes	1,497,878	1,522,098	- 2	- 27
Green and wax beans	511,897	629,098	- 19	- 17
Peaches	664,921	844,138	- 21	-
Pears	249,693	299,819	- 17	- 28
Total (6 items)	5,533,105	5,945,500	- 7	-

Tariff Commission Reports on the Tuna Industry

The Tariff Commission has sent to the Senate a report on tuna fish made in compliance with a Senate resolution calling for a report on "the importation into the United States of fresh and frozen tuna fish and its effect on the production of tuna fish by United States fishing vessels."

A preliminary survey of the industry showed that nearly all the tuna caught by American fishermen, as well as that imported in frozen form, is canned, and that the canning and fishing enterprises are closely allied. For this reason the Commission extended the scope of the investigation to cover the canning of tuna in the United States and the importation of canned tuna. Excerpts from the Commission's report follow:

The Commission's investigation disclosed that the importation of fresh and frozen tuna into the United States had had relatively little effect on the production of tuna by United States fishing vessels, but that the importation of canned tuna has had an important effect.

Imports of fresh tuna are insignificant, amounting in recent years to about one million pounds annually, or less than 2 per cent of the domestic catch. Imports of frozen tuna, which come exclusively from Japan, have been larger, about 5 million pounds, or 7 per cent of the average domestic catch in recent years. This frozen tuna is canned by the same packers which can the domestic catch. Since 1932 the imports of canned tuna have been much larger than the combined imports of fresh and frozen tuna. For the three years ended 1934, imports of frozen and canned tuna combined (the frozen in terms of canned) represented about 27 per cent of the domestic consumption of canned tuna.

The competition caused by imported frozen and canned tuna has been less marked in 1934 and 1935 than in 1932 and 1933 as a result of (1) an advance in the exchange value of the Japanese yen following the devaluation of the United States currency, (2) an increase in the import duty on canned tuna on January 13, 1934, from 30 to 45 per cent ad valorem, and (3) an exceptionally small catch of albacore tuna in Japan in 1934.

Prior to 1930 imports of canned tuna were negligible and consisted mainly of fish packed in olive oil and marketed as tonno or tunny. Most imports were from European countries. In 1930, however, the Japanese began to can tuna primarily for export to the United States; these exports increased to 1 million pounds in 1931, 6 million pounds in 1932, and 14 million pounds in 1933, but dropped to 8 million pounds in 1934. Our imports of canned tuna in 1933 represented about 30 per cent of the domestic consumption and in 1934 they were 15 per cent.

Since 1914, apart from temporary fluctuations arising largely from natural rather than economic causes, there has been a steady and fairly marked upward trend in production and consumption of canned tuna in the United States. From 1914 to 1921 the average annual domestic output was about 13 million pounds; from 1922 to 1926, about 18 million pounds; and from 1927 to 1934, about 32 million pounds. The bulk of this increased output has been the product of United States fisheries, but since 1928 about 7 per cent of the raw material used (fresh and frozen tuna) has been frozen tuna from Japan.

Canadian Fruit and Vegetable Pack in 1935

Preliminary statistics on the Canadian pack of canned fruits and vegetables in 1935 have been issued by the Canadian Bureau of Statistics, which collected the figures in co-operation with the Canning Division of the Canadian Department of Agriculture. The following table shows the pack in 1935 (subject to revision) as compared with 1934:

	1934		1935	
	Cases Number	Net weight Pounds	Cases Number	Net weight Pounds
FRUITS				
Apples	166,379	5,896,323	148,229	5,802,034
Blueberries	49,741	1,439,673	44,996	1,292,127
Cherries	98,220	3,448,965	185,447	6,064,502
Peaches	187,548	5,913,111	434,593	13,197,751
Pears	440,550	14,321,634	456,431	14,570,669
Plums	48,054	1,420,141	108,074	3,600,747
Raspberries	46,750	1,381,247	76,037	2,249,434
Rhubarb	8,040	326,207	9,709	405,176
Strawberries	30,363	851,183	45,268	1,343,435
Loganberries	61,825	2,483,247	38,135	1,187,455
Apricots	50,261	1,520,370	36,295	931,049
VEGETABLES				
Asparagus	57,120	1,439,097	86,174	2,010,959
Beans, green or wax	372,607	10,407,213	372,651	10,644,020
Beans, baked and other	1,067,373	37,974,063	967,394	33,464,971
Beets	33,355	1,003,489	42,606	1,219,440
Carrots	21,021	624,474	10,268	293,048
Corn, cream of	818,294	24,504,004	1,161,244	35,299,041
Corn on cob	10,421	530,518	10,330	494,392
Peas	1,369,454	41,257,327	1,984,171	60,544,281
Pumpkin	107,334	4,479,507	84,127	3,362,367
Spinach	38,434	1,216,515	28,387	860,433
Tomatoes	2,122,520	88,992,394	1,609,309	66,257,826
Tomato juice	711,844	17,818,545	676,819	17,927,540
Tomato paste and puree	141,321	5,618,365	81,183	3,709,955
Tomato pulp		3,199,614		9,543,781
All other vegetables	27,799	696,941	42,072	1,121,268
Soups, all kinds	2,022,300	49,820,986	2,084,850	55,379,813
Catsup and sauces	61,995,761		61,016,455	16,789,296

a Gallons; b Cases.

New Director Named for Consumers' Division

Walton H. Hamilton, Director of the Consumers' Division of the Labor Department, has been appointed Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board. He is succeeded as Director of the Consumers' Division by Clarence E. Ayres, professor of economics at the University of Texas. The announcement of Mr. Ayres' appointment stated:

"Mr. Ayres, who was born in Lowell, Mass., in 1891, was educated at Brown, Harvard and the University of Chicago, where he obtained his Ph. D. in 1917. Thereafter he held a fellowship in philosophy at the University of Chicago, was assistant professor of philosophy at Amherst, professor of philosophy at Reed College, associate editor of the New Republic magazine, professor of the principles of education at Ohio State University, and lecturer on philosophy and adviser for the Experimental College of the University of Wisconsin. Since 1930 he has been professor of economics at the University of Texas, at Austin, Texas."

Experiments With Derris As a Control for Pea Aphid

The Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine of the Department of Agriculture has released in mimeographed form an article by J. E. Dudley, Jr., T. E. Bronson and F. E. Carroll describing experiments made during 1935 with derris in control of aphid on peas. The data in this paper were presented at a meeting of the American Association of Economic Entomologists at St. Louis in December and the article will be published in the *Journal of Economic Entomology*.

The summary and conclusions, as stated in the article, are as follows:

"Greenhouse tests demonstrated that ground derris as a spray, applied at the rate of from 1½ pounds to 5 pounds per 100 gallons of water (0.006 to 0.022 per cent of rotenone), with a spreader and wetting agent, killed nearly 100 per cent of the aphids on the treated plants. The aphids died throughout a period of from 3 to 5 days, and practically no reproduction occurred in the interim.

"Many summer field tests, on both small and large plots, demonstrated that ground derris as a spray, applied at the rate of from ¼ pound to 5 pounds per 100 gallons (0.0009 to 0.022 per cent of rotenone), with a spreader and wetting agent, killed more than 90 per cent of the aphids on the treated plants, that from 3 to 5 days were required to obtain the maximum mortality, and that little or no reproduction occurred during that period. These tests further revealed that the application of derris sprays increased the yield of shelled peas approximately 88 per cent over that of untreated checks.

"A large number of tests on late-planted peas revealed that derris as a spray, with a spreader and wetting agent, applied prior to aphid infestation protected the plants from appreciable damage for several weeks and resulted in an ultimate infestation considerably lower than had developed in the untreated checks; that heavy applications of derris sprays after the incidence of an infestation protected peas from damage from a commercial standpoint for nearly a month, enabling them to produce a normal crop of pods; that heavy applications of derris sprays with any one of several spreaders and wetting agents, made after the infestation had become heavy, killed approximately 95 per cent of the aphids; that derris sprays controlled the aphid more quickly and to a higher degree than did derris dusts; and that concentrations of derris as low as ¼ to ½ pound (0.0009 to 0.0019 per cent of rotenone) per 100 gallons, with spreaders and wetting agents, killed approximately as large a percentage of aphids as did 3 pounds per 100 gallons.

"On the basis of the experiments reported herein, it appears that sprays of ground derris root containing 0.0044 per cent of rotenone, or possibly lesser concentrations, with a spreader and wetting agent, applied to pea vines while aphids are present in small numbers give promise of effective control of the pea aphid."

The Bureau of Entomology considers the information accumulated thus far as too limited in scope to make possible definite recommendations to growers and canners regarding the use of derris. Mimeographed copies of Mr. Dudley's article, however, are available for distribution on

request to the United States Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Division of Truck Crop and Garden Insect Investigations, Washington, D. C.

National Retail Grocers Week

The National Association of Retail Grocers of the United States has designated the week beginning March 16th, 1936, as "National Retail Grocers Week," the purpose of which will be to make the consuming public fully conscious of the real importance to them of the retail grocers, of which there are 400,000 in the United States.

Since the National Association approved the plans for the event, many of the leading food manufacturers, jobbers, brokers and associations have announced their intentions to cooperate to make it the outstanding food event of the year.

A systematic advertising campaign is being developed, details of which are to be announced later.

Employed Women under N.R.A. Codes

The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor has published a 144-page bulletin entitled "Employed Women under N.R.A. Codes" dealing with the labor provisions of the chief codes for industries that employ large numbers of women, including the canning industry. Besides a general summary of the situation of employed women under N.R.A. codes, there are separate sections dealing with the minimum wage levels as provided in the codes, maximum hours of work for women under the codes, and code provisions for groups of women that could be paid wages below the usual code minimum. For selected codes, including canning, there is also presented a more detailed analysis of hours, employment and wages provisions.

An interesting feature of the bulletin is a table in which are given average weekly earnings and indexes of employment and payrolls for selected months in 1933 and 1934 for various industries, including canning. The industries were selected from those reporting monthly to the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the percentage change in per capita weekly earning was computed from unpublished data of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Copies of the bulletin can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., for 20 cents each.

Three Suits Successfully Defended

Three suits brought by consumers against member canners of the Association were tried and successfully defended during the month of January.

In one case a woman claimed illness from canned food which appeared to be all right when eaten, but which upon later examination was said to be "moldy." No medical testimony or report of laboratory examination of the suspected food was submitted by the plaintiff. The retailer, investigator and a representative of the Association's research laboratories testified for the defense, and the court rendered a decision in favor of the defense.

Another case involved five claims of illness attributed to canned fish, although all those who became ill ate several other foods. The canned fish was apparently in good con-

dition, and the plaintiff's case was largely dependent on testimony of the attending physician, who testified that no matter how food was prepared or stored, it would decompose and that fish was notoriously a cause of illness. This testimony was quite thoroughly broken down by cross examination and by testimony of a member of the research laboratory staff, and a motion of dismissal was sustained by the court.

The third victory resulted largely from doubt raised by the defense as to the cause of the illness claimed, and by the scientific testimony furnished to satisfy the court that the bacteria said to have been found in a sample of one of the foods eaten was not of a harmful type.

Fruit and Vegetable Market Competition

Carlot Shipments as Reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture

Commodity	Week ending		Week ending	Total for season	
	Feb. 1	1936	Jan. 25	through Feb. 1	1936
1935	1935	1936	1936	1935	1936
Vegetables:					
Beans, snap and lima	77	193	156	1,741	2,382
Tomatoes	162	218	164	1,893	2,174
Green peas	81	124	125	517	567
Spinach	48	167	318	2,219	2,957
All other vegetables:					
Domestic, competing directly	3,961	3,642	3,278	110,651	94,961
Imports—					
Competing directly ..	49	74	75	86	389
Competing indirectly ..	54	26	41	780	1,256
Fruits:					
Citrus, domestic ..	3,589	2,491	2,845	53,638	42,200
Imports	8	4	0	272	400
Others, domestic ..	109	83	103	16,823	14,318

Grapefruit Production and Outlook

The pack of grapefruit during the 1934-35 season was the largest on record, amounting to 3,810,118 standard cases (24 No. 2's). The largest previous year was that of 1930-31, when 2,724,489 cases were packed. The pack of grapefruit juice in 1934-35 amounted to 2,741,091 standard cases (24 No. 2's), which was more than three times the size of the pack of any previous year.

A very high percentage of the United States pack of both grapefruit sections and grapefruit juice is canned in Florida. However, Texas, California and Arizona are packing increasing quantities. Porto Rico packed about 187,000 cases of grapefruit sections last year and 12,230 cases of juice. No other country of the world packs grapefruit or grapefruit juice in commercial quantities.

The principal reason for the heavy increase in the pack in 1934-35 was the large production of grapefruit, which amounted to 21,357,000 boxes, the largest production on record. The average for the five-year period, 1929-1933, was 14,929,000 boxes. Of the production last year, approximately 29 per cent was marketed through the medium of canning, either as sections or as juice. During 1933-34 only 21 per cent of the crop was canned, and in 1929-31, the year of

largest previous production and also the year of largest previous pack, only about 17 per cent of the crop was utilized by the canning industry.

Another reason for the large pack of last year was the fact that the price of fresh grapefruit on the New York market averaged only \$2.04 a box compared with \$2.41 for 1933-34. The New York price for 1932-33 averaged the same as for last year, but the farm price in Florida was only \$0.81 per box in 1932-33 whereas last year it averaged \$0.91 a box. This more favorable price to farmers in 1934-35 in spite of a much larger crop can be explained in part by the fact that it was possible to market more than twice as much through the medium of canning, thus leaving only 15,812,000 boxes to be marketed fresh last year, compared with 12,620,000 boxes marketed fresh during 1932-33.

The grapefruit canning industry is therefore marketing a fairly substantial percentage of the grapefruit crop. This has been possible because of the increasing popularity of canned grapefruit and grapefruit juice. The increase in sales during recent years has been very largely in the domestic market. Fairly large quantities, however, are sold to foreign countries.

The largest buyer of American canned grapefruit has been the United Kingdom. During 1934-35 a total of 883,394 cases were exported, of which 863,408 were sold to the United Kingdom. In analyzing the United Kingdom market, it is interesting to note that during 1934-35 the exports of canned grapefruit to the United Kingdom were almost twice as much as the exports of fresh. This can be explained in part by the fact that the United States is practically the only source of canned grapefruit, whereas the United Kingdom imports large quantities of fresh grapefruit from British West Indies, South Africa, Cuba, and Palestine. The total imports of fresh grapefruit into the United Kingdom for 1934-35 were 1,815,000 boxes, or a little more than twice as much as their imports of canned grapefruit from the United States. (One case of canned grapefruit is approximately equal to one box of fresh fruit.)

The next most important foreign market for American canned grapefruit is Canada, where 8,247 cases were sold during 1934-35. The exports of fresh grapefruit to Canada during the same period, however, were 467,256 boxes. The total Canadian imports of fresh grapefruit for 1934-35 were 525,952 boxes. Thus it appears that the United Kingdom has been a distinctly better market for American canned grapefruit than Canada.

The future of the grapefruit industry in the United States as indicated by a recent "outlook statement" issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, is for an upward trend in production. There are now about 192,000 acres of grapefruit in the continental United States, nearly one-fifth of which has not yet reached producing age. Of the 155,300 acres in production, around 58 per cent is from 4 to 10 years old, 18 per cent is from 11 to 15 years old, and about 24 per cent is 16 years old and over.

In Florida about one-fourth, and in Texas about two-thirds of the trees are from 4 to 10 years old. In actual numbers Texas has more grapefruit trees than Florida, and in the young-bearing group (from 4 to 10 years old). Texas has just short of three times as many trees as Florida. In Arizona three-fourths of the total grapefruit trees are of

bearing age, and of those in bearing practically all are less than 11 years old.

Grapefruit production has not moved upward as rapidly as the increase in number of trees might indicate. This is partly because of the newness of the plantings and partly because of two tropical storms that reduced the Texas crop in each of the last two years far below that expected in the early season.

It is estimated that the trees now in bearing in Texas are capable of producing under average weather conditions, a crop as high as 5,000,000 boxes, and with good conditions the crop might exceed 6,000,000 boxes. A year of average conditions in all of the four states, Florida, Texas, Arizona and California, at the same time, might mean a crop of nearly 23,000,000 boxes, and if conditions were good, or similar to those in 1930, the crop could exceed 25,000,000 boxes.

Based upon an average condition, it appears that grapefruit growers can expect crops in excess of 20,000,000 boxes to occur frequently over the next decade. Thus far the largest crop yet recorded was in 1934, when 20,957,000 boxes were produced, with conditions somewhat below average. The average United States price received by producers for this crop was 92 cents per box, which was the lowest price except in the depression year of 1932, when the price dropped to 84 cents per box. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics states:

"Trend of both domestic and foreign production of grapefruit is definitely upward. Thus far it appears that United States crops of around 20,000,000 boxes have been difficult to market and it further appears probable that crops of 20,000,000 boxes or more are likely to occur frequently.

"With large crops of grapefruit in prospect for at least the next decade, it seems clear that growers cannot expect the restoration of prices to pre-depression levels."

For 1935-36, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics says that the price prospects appear to be fairly bright. The crop to be marketed will probably be smaller than in 1934-35, and with demand expected to be better in 1936 some price improvement can be expected.

Wilt Resistant Peas Bred by the Wisconsin Experiment Station

A statement describing varieties of canning peas bred and introduced by the Wisconsin Experiment Station was presented to interested pea canners during the recent convention in Chicago. This statement was prepared in mimeographed form by E. J. Delwiche, well known to canners as the originator of Wisconsin Early Sweet and other varieties now receiving recognition in the canning industry. Mr. Delwiche discussed the Wisconsin pea breeding program and prepared the descriptions of the wilt-resistant canning varieties bred by the Wisconsin Experiment Station at the suggestion of the Association's Raw Products Bureau. His statement was

distributed at the Raw Products Conference on peas on January 22nd.

Copies of this statement, which include the description and history of Alcross, No. 19 Alaska, Wisconsin Early Sweet, Wisconsin Resistant Perfection and Wisconsin Penin may be obtained from E. J. Delwiche, Wisconsin Experiment Station, Madison, Wisconsin.

In connection with the history and description of Wisconsin Early Sweet it is stated: "Wisconsin Early Sweet was originated from a cross between Alcross Alaska (wilt resistant) and Surprise (susceptible to wilt). It closely resembles Surprise in seed type and season, but does possess somewhat greater vigor. It differs from Surprise in that it is 100 per cent resistant to the common wilt disease; whereas, Surprise is completely susceptible. The resistant character in Wisconsin Early Sweet was derived from the Alaska parent.

"Surprise was produced in 1889 by F. H. Horsford, of Charlotte, Vt., being a cross between Alaska (Earliest of All) and American Wonder. It was introduced by J. J. H. Gregory, of Marblehead, Mass., in 1897. The same cross was made in 1883 by E. S. Goff at the New York Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva, and was named Station. Station and Surprise were very similar. They were separately listed for some time by seedsmen, but Station has either been blended with Surprise or lost.

"There has been some misunderstanding on the part of seedsmen and canner, as to the relationship between these two varieties. It should be noted here that Surprise itself is susceptible to common Fusarium wilt; and therefore, it is not possible to isolate from it any resistant lines, unless the selections, made by accident, were out of natural crosses which occur in the field. This is not very likely. The Wisconsin Early Sweet variety was produced, as per a definite plan, with the purpose of producing a wilt-resistant early sweet type. That is exactly what it is.

"The Wisconsin Early Sweet was introduced to the seed trade by the Wisconsin Experiment Station in 1931. Its canning qualities are fully as high as the Surprise. The product goes in the same trade. Selection work for further improvement is still in progress, but so far, nothing superior has been introduced by us. Most seedsmen are listing the Wisconsin Early Sweet, and many of them are ready to fill orders. Several canners have canned this new variety and are finding the product of first-class quality."

Present Guides for Household Buying

The U. S. Department of Agriculture issued in January as Miscellaneous Publication No. 193 a revision of its pamphlet entitled "Present Guides for Household Buying," which was first published in April, 1934. The bulletin discusses existing types of consumer guides and quality grades now in use, and deals principally with guides established by Federal and national agencies. No effort was made to include all of the many State regulations and grading systems. A valuable feature of the pamphlet is an extensive list of references to literature cited.